

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending and under consideration. No amendments to the claims have been made by this response.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

Claims 1-21 are pending and under consideration. In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,805,253 to Mori et al., ("Mori"). Office Action at page 2. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully assert that the Examiner misinterpreted the Mori reference. Specifically, the Examiner interpreted Mori to teach, in part, an "orientation direction in the optically anisotropic layer plane of the optically anisotropic compound in the two optically anisotropic layers intersecting each other at an angle of from 80 to 100 degrees (**transmission axis, PA and PB oriented at 90 degrees, Col. 20, Lines 48-52**)..." (See Office Action at page 2).

The Examiner is correct in observing that Mori teaches that the "transmission axes PA and PB are preferably perpendicular or parallel [to] each other..." (Mori, col. 20, lines 49-51). However, Mori teaches that "PA and PB are transmission axes of *polarizing sheets A and B, not of optically anisotropic layers*. (Mori, col. 20, lines 39-40, emphasis added). In other words, the section cited by the Examiner does not support his conclusion because it does not teach that the "the orientation direction in the optically anisotropic layer plane of the optically anisotropic compound in the two optically anisotropic layers intersecting each other at an angle of from 80 to 100 degrees..." (E.g., claim 1, lines 3-5). Instead, it merely teaches that the polarizing sheets may be oriented perpendicularly to each other.

In actuality, Mori does not teach or suggest "the orientation direction in the optically anisotropic layer plane of the optically anisotropic compound in the two optically anisotropic layers intersecting each other at an angle of from 80 to 100 degrees..." (e.g., claim 1, lines 3-5). The closest that the art teaches or suggests is that the optically anisotropic layers of the optical compensatory sheets OC1 and OC2 have directions that are parallel to each other, and can have directions that are

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

opposite, but still parallel, to that. (See, e.g., Mori, Fig. 9, items "R2", "OC2", "R1", and "OC1", and col. 20, lines 27-40). Accordingly, Applicants submit that Mori does not teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1.

Claim 19 recites, in part, "the optical compensation sheet comprising at least two optically anisotropic layers each formed by orienting an optically anisotropic compound, and the orientation direction in the optically anisotropic layer plane of the optically anisotropic compound in the two optically anisotropic layers intersecting each other at an angle of from 80 to 100 degrees..." Applicants assert that the arguments above relating to claim 1 apply equally to claim 19. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Mori does not teach or suggest each and every element of claim 19.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Mori does not teach or suggest claims 1 or 19, and that these claims are patentable over Mori. Claims 2-18 and 21 directly or ultimately depend from claim 1, and claim 20 depends from claim 19. Thus, these claims are also patentable over Mori.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to Deposit Account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: December 18, 2003

By: 

John Y. Pfeifer
Reg. No. 52,120

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com